IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.106 OF 2007
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 2210 OF 2004

Cyril Pereira ....Petitioners.

V/s

M.C.G.M. & Ors. .....Respondents.

-

Mr. K.K. Singhvi with Ms. Archana Joshi for the applicants/respondents - Municipal Corporation in support of the Notice of Motion.

Mr. R.M. Nakhwa i/b Mr. Vasant Dhavan for the Petitioners.

ALONG WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.2177 OF 2004

Joseph Leslie Dragar Mfg.
Pvt. Ltd. and Anr. ....Petitioners.

V/s

Municipal Corporation of Greater
Mumbai & Ors. ....Respondents.

Mr. R.M. Nakhwa i/b Mr. Vasant Dhavan for the Petitioners.

Mr. K.K. Singhvi with Ms. Archana Joshi for the Respondents - Municipal Corporation.

ALONGWITH

WRIT PETITION NO.2178 OF 2004

M/s. Joseph Leslie Co. ....Petitioners.

V/s

The Municipal Corporation of
Greater Mumbai & Ors. .....Respondents.

Mr. R.M. Nakhwa i/b Mr. Vasant Dhavan for the Petitioners.

Mr. K.K. Singhvi with Ms. Archana Joshi for the Respondents - Municipal Corporation.

CORAM: V.M. KANADE, J.

DATE : 3rd April, 2007.

P.C.:

1. This common order is passed in Notice of Motion No. 106 of 2007 in Writ Petition No.2210 of 2004 as also in Writ Petition No. 2177 of 2004 & Writ Petition No.2178 of 2004 in which no Notice of Motion has been taken out.

2. This Notice of Motion is taken out by the Corporation

for vacating the interim relief which has been granted by this Court by order dated 26th October, 2004. This Notice of Motion is taken out in view of the Division Bench Judgment of this Court dated 27th March, 2006 in Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai v. Dalamal Tower Premises Co-operative Society Limited reported in **2006 (3) Bom. C.R. 557** in which similar issue came to be decided in favour of the Municipal Corporation and the revised assessment was upheld.

3. Against the said judgment and order, Special Leave Petition was filed before the Supreme Court and leave to appeal was granted and the following interim directions were issued:-

> "The recovery on the basis of revised enhanced assessment from the appellants is stayed subject to the condition that besides the undisputed amount, the appellants also deposit with the respondent - Corporation fifty per cent of the difference between the assessment and the revised enhanced assessment within a period of six weeks

> and also give an undertaking that in case the appeal is dismissed and revised assessment is upheld, the balance amount would be paid with interest at the rate of 6-1/4%. Likewise, the Principal Assessor and Collector, on behalf of the Commissioner and the Corporation, will file an undertaking that in case the appeals are allowed and revised assessment is set aside, fifty per cent of the payment made on the basis of the revised assessment would be refunded to the appellants with the same rate of interest i.e. 6-1/4%."

4. In view of the order that has been passed by the Supreme Court on 11th September, 2006 in the aforesaid case, appropriate orders will have to be passed in this case modifying the interim order dated 26th October, 2004.

5. Under the circumstances, the said order dated 26th October, 2005 is modified and it is directed that Petitioners to deposit with the Respondent - Corporation 50% of the difference between the assessment and the revised enhanced assessment within a period of six weeks and

Petitioners also to give an undertaking that in case the appeal is dismissed and the revised assessment is upheld, the balance amount would be paid with interest @ 6-1/4% per annum. Similarly, the Principal Assessor and Collector on behalf of the Commissioner & Corporation will file an undertaking that in case the appeals are allowed and revised assessment is set aside 50% of the payment made on the basis of revised assessment will be refunded to the Petitioners with the same rate of interest i.e. 6-1/4% per annum.

6. The Notice of Motion is accordingly disposed of.

(V.M. KANADE, J.)